

REMARKS

Claims 1-28 were pending. Claims 1-20, 23 and 28 have been cancelled, claims 21, 24, 25, and 27 have been amended, and claims 29-47 have been added. Accordingly, claims remain pending subsequent entry of the present amendment. Added claims 29-47 generally correspond to features found in cancelled claims 1-20.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 24 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Rejections

In the present Office Action, claims 1-6, 8-23, and 25-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant’s Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter “APA”) and “HP Blade Sever bh7800 Installation Guide” (hereinafter “HP”). In addition, claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over APA and HP, in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,445,970 (hereinafter “Hedman”). Applicant respectfully traverses the above rejections and requests reconsideration.

In view of the cancellation of claims 1-20, the rejections of these claims is rendered moot. In the present Office Action, claim 23 was rejected over APA in view of HP. However, Applicant disagrees with this rejection. Claim 23 recites the features wherein:

“the console is arranged so that, when notified of a malfunction of a component of any assembly, the console will automatically enable the display and switches of that assembly to allow replacement or repair of the component and/or testing of the component.”

It is suggested that these features are disclosed by APA and HP. In particular, paragraph 5 of the Applicant's Description and page 46 of HP are cited as disclosing these features. However, Applicant submits these features are not disclosed therein. Paragraph 5 of Applicant's Description is reproduced below:

“Such assemblies are often provided as rack-mounted systems, and are housed in data centres which contain a large number of rows of assemblies extending for scores or even up to a hundred metres. When one of the assemblies malfunctions, a service engineer is called out to repair the assembly, normally by quiescing the assembly, replacing the component if it is in the form of a field-replaceable unit (FRU), and then testing the component. The assemblies typically have a console interface that communicates with the service processor, and, in use, is connected to a console in the form of a personal computer located in the data centre so that the service engineer can log on to the console and obtain access to the relevant assembly. This operation can, however, take a significant amount of time. The service engineer will typically go to the remote console to diagnose the problem, walk to the assembly to repair the malfunction, and return to the console to verify the repair. For many service procedures this may involve repeating this operation a number of times, requiring the service engineer to walk hundreds of metres between the electronics assembly and the console. It would be possible for the service engineer to reduce the time taken for such a repair for example by taking a laptop computer with him to the relevant assembly for diagnostic purposes rather than returning to the console. However, the physical layout of such data centres is such that it is not easy or convenient to use a laptop at the racks of assemblies. Furthermore, operators of the data centres are understandably reluctant to allow individuals to bring computers into the building if they are then going to operate on the servers, in view of the sensitivity of the data held by the network and the possible damage to the network caused either by unauthorized reconfiguration of the network or by the introduction of a virus. Accordingly, it is desired that all servicing or repair operations be conducted employing only computer equipment that is owned by the network operators.”

In addition, page 46 of HP merely describes the Management Blade, Management LAN (RTM) Blade, and HP Server Blade. However, there is no disclosure therein regarding notification of a malfunction of a component and automatically enabling the

display and switches to allow replacement or repair of the component and/or testing of the component.

Further, claim 28 which recited features similar to that of claim 23 was rejected over APA in view of page 48 of HP. However, as already noted, APA does not disclose these features and page 48 of HP merely describes the LCD Display Panel of the bh7800. Again, there is no disclosure concerning notification of a malfunction of a component and automatically enabling the display and switches to allow replacement or repair of the component and/or testing of the component.

In view of the above, Applicant submits each of claims 21 and 27, which have been amended to include the above discussed features of claims 23 and 28, respectively, are patentably distinguishable from the combination of cited art. Accordingly, a *prima facie* case of obviousness is not been established for these claims. The dependent claims are distinguished for at least the above reasons as well.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any extensions of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) are necessary to prevent the above referenced application(s) from becoming abandoned, Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extensions. If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5681-70200/RDR.

Respectfully submitted,

/Rory D. Rankin/

Name Rory D. Rankin
Reg. No. 47,884
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8800

Date: April 17, 2007